

PCT

23 2005
22 FEB 2005

To:
BL BANERJEE
DEPENNING & DEPENNING,
31 SOUTH BANK ROAD,
CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU, INDIA 600028

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 12 OCT 2004
LAILA:INT:007		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/IN04/00056	International filing date (day/month/year) 09 March 2004 (09.03.2004)	Priority date (day/month/year)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): C07C 51/42, 59/265; A01N 37/00; C01B 31/30 and U.S. Cl.: 562/580, 584; 514/574; 424/439		
Applicant RAJU, GOKARAJU G		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |


2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer Jafar Parsa  Telephone No. (571)272-2717
--	---

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IN04/00056

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____ which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/IN04/00056

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims 1-7 and 9-16

YES

Claims 8

NO

Inventive step (IS)

Claims 1-7 and 9-16

YES

Claims 8

NO

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims 1-16

YES

Claims NONE

NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-7 and 9-16 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the triple metal salts of hydroxycitric acid of formula I (see claim 1). The prior art also fails to teach a process of preparing a process for the preparation of triple salts of hydroxycitric acid comprising reacting a suspension of calcium hydroxycitrate with aqueous magnesium carbonate followed by aqueous potassium hydroxide solution.

Claim 8 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Moffett et al.

Moffett et al disclose a process for preparing and purifying aqueous extract of hydroxycitric acid by passing extract of Garcinia rind through anion exchange column followed by cation exchange column (see col. 2, lines 43-50 and col. 3, lines 45-60).